

February 2004

Charleston Conference Future Dates

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editor (2004) "Charleston Conference Future Dates," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 16: Iss. 1, Article 36.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5439>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

Op Ed from page 40

organization, archiving and technical migration) in this area alone.

The second situation is where the institutional repository and the publisher hold different versions of the same content. That happens now when **Elsevier** journal authors post their version of a preprint or accepted paper on a local server. It is not the official journal PDF/HTML version that is available on **ScienceDirect**. The two versions can co-exist, perhaps a little uneasily but not terribly so. The publisher assures content integrity and should also ensure permanent archiving of the definitive version.

Some people look to a future where the institutional repository becomes the official place of publication and replaces the publisher. There are a lot of reasons why this vision is a long way from being fulfilled — if it ever will be. I recently looked at ten of the most recently released articles for seven of our journals well-positioned within their fields. For those 70 articles the authors came from 127 institutions in 28 countries. Besides universities there were government agencies, corporations, independent labs and hospitals. While the largest of these entities may have established an institutional repository, most have not and will not any time soon.

In addition, institutional repositories do not have the neutrality for discipline-based peer review. Nor is it how researchers think about seek-

ing out information. I openly acknowledge that researchers are not looking for “an **Elsevier** article.” (This point is vividly made, as someone said to me, when you think that no one goes into a music store thinking “I want to buy a Sony CD today.”) But neither are they looking for “a **University of Kentucky/Minnesota/California** article.” Yes, the leading research centers in a field will have their followers, but it is the journal that facilitates bringing everyone together.

And this is just looking at journals. What about the books that faculty write? Does anyone really think that institutional repositories should be the home for these as well?

What then of complementarity? I suspect that there are a number of ways in which publishers and institutional repositories could work together. **Clifford Lynch** has suggested (*ARL Biomonthly Report* 226) that we could look at datasets. Publishers have by and large not included large datasets in their archives, and probably we aren't the best ones to do this. But institutional repositories may be (assuming that there is no discipline-based archive already in existence).

Standards are another place where we have complementary interests. The DOI, for example, is now the standard for reference linking. DOIs should be used to link out from references in dissertations and technical reports. DOI look-ups are free, so this is something to be encouraged. Similarly, both institutional repositories and publishers can endorse **OAIS** for archival purposes.

That makes for a relatively modest Challenge No. 3 for 2004: look for ways to work constructively with institutional repositories. No nightmares here (but the year is young).

The final thing on my mind in the middle of the night — if not crowded out by funding and price model challenges, open access and (maybe once or twice) institutional repositories — is what role technological advances can and should play in product development. There is so very much we (advanced publishers) can do. What should we do — and can

we hope to recover our costs and even profit from enhancements?

This issue really brings the three preceding ones together, for it is a question of how to make future investments. Purchasing budgets are very tight. Author-paid publishing is essentially plain vanilla publishing: post an article, perhaps make links from the references, but that's about it. Institutional repositories are even more stark. One cannot expect that many will develop sophisticated data mining or data visualization tools, for example. (Which is not to say it cannot happen or is not already happening — far be it from me to underestimate the power of motivated grad students and faculty.)

We have reached the point where difficult decisions have to be made about what to invest in. In our case we have a group of sophisticated library customers who help us think through the options. That helps. But what are the risks, just as is happening in some cases now, that for all the benefit that can be seen in having access to a large corpus of electronic information, it may not be affordable, or we will have the same problem with technical features. They are nice, but there is no money to pay for them (i.e., for the publisher to recoup its investment). That's Challenge No. 4 for 2004: understanding how to make better decisions on product-related technology investments.

I could go on — customer service, for example. (Please don't groan.) We have five special task forces looking at that right now and as they are filled with competent people and well-motivated (i.e., the directive to get things right came from the very top), it will get done. Yes, I would like to hear any customer service concerns from librarians (k.hunter@elsevier.com), but this is not keeping me awake. I do believe in the power of miracles.

That is the beauty of being in Strategy rather than Operations: I have the option (and responsibility) to look at the big picture and pretend for a moment that the day-to-day problems will be handled. So think with me on big picture items as well, so we have new challenges to look forward to a year from now. 🍄

The Persistence of Perception from page 38

course reserve system with **Docutek** and the relatively new “**Ask A Librarian**” online reference service has helped us open new avenues for reaching our users. We are trying to entice potential users to the library by enhancing our popular periodical browse area, establishing a Browsing Collection for books of popular interests, initiating a library book club, and maintaining an Art Corner for the display of local artwork. The Public Services Department is getting more involved in information literacy and has compiled several subject modules. In conjunction with the information literacy modules, the Library Director has requested that Deans and Department Heads allow librarians to come into their classrooms to teach course related bibliographic instruction.

We have also created a library committee that specifically deals with library public relations. Our librarians feel that the best way to combat the persistence of perception that our collection has insufficient resources is to take every opportunity to emphasize our capabilities. The perception of inadequate resources was not born in a day and it will not go away quickly. However, if we proactively seek means and methods for keeping our patrons informed about our services and the collection, the perception will gradually vanish. 🍄

charleston conference dates

future

Preconferences and Vendor Showcase

Main Conference

2004	3 November	4-6 November
2005	2 November	3-5 November
2006	8 November	9-11 November
2007	7 November	8-10 November
2008	5 November	6-8 November
2009	4 November	5-7 November
2010	3 November	4-6 November